



➤ FACULTY & STAFF ASSOCIATION

➤ UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE FRASER VALLEY

➤ 33844 KING ROAD, R.R.#2,

➤ ABBOTSFORD, B.C. V2S 4N2

(604) 854-4530
FAX: 853-9540

RECEIVED
SEP 20 1993
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE
FRASER VALLEY (ABBOTSFORD)

LETTER

NEWS



January 1992
Vol. 17, No. 4



IN THIS ISSUE

From the Editor	Page 1
President's Report	2
Report from the First Staff V.P.	4
Report from the Contract Chair	5
Deliberations of the Standing Committee on Faculty Evaluations	7
Meanderings of the FSA Contract Subcommittee on University College Issues on Workload Compensation and Scholarly Activity	9
Into the Black with Meade and Bly	11
David & Barry's Excellent Wine Adventures	14
The New World Order and Tradition: Part 1	15

FSA NEWSLETTER

January 1992

From the Editor . . .

This issue's focus is clearly on our upcoming contract negotiations, yet you will also find articles on other important matters. For example, Graham Dowden provides insight into the burgeoning men's movement and Ron Dart explores the ideology of the (old) New World Order. And--at long last--our intrepid wine tasters return with another adventure of the plunk kind.

Falling just short of outright hectoring, I want to encourage all of you to read the reports submitted by Virginia and Ian. Virginia gives a clear picture of the work of the University-College Contract Subcommittee on issues germane to expansion, she also discusses C-IEA's positions on several key issues, and she finishes with an overview of important items pertaining to the Agreements Committee. In a series of reports, Ian focuses on these three areas: contract, workload compensation and scholarly activity, and faculty evaluation. All are critical issues. You will find much to contemplate, and perhaps after reading these articles you will be better prepared for our important General Meeting on the 29th of January.

Unfortunately Perla Werk was not able to make her usual submission. As many of you know, she had to undergo surgery and is now convalescing. Of course we all wish her a speedy, and complete, recovery.

Richard Heyman, our ever hale and hearty staff VP, discusses in his report a document

more interesting than Scott Turow's latest page-turner. When you have a few minutes to spare, you may want to have a peek (easy-to-follow directions are to be found in Richard's article).

That's all the news that's fit to print.

Well, almost.

Although I promised myself that I would keep this editorial short so that you could spend your time more fruitfully on the items contained within these pages, I can't refrain from updating you on an international story, one that should not be allowed to be forgotten even if the media have lapsed into a kind of collective amnesia.

Though he made a surprise speech in New York in December, Salman Rushdie starts his fourth year in hiding on February 15th. How serious is the Iranian government about the *fatwah* after all this time? In his New York speech, Rushdie made it clear that things have only worsened: the Japanese translator of *The Satanic Verses* was stabbed to death while its Italian translator was severely wounded. Rushdie also told his audience "that there was news of an attempt to find and kill me by contract killers working directly for the Iranian government." We must not ignore this persecution.

With that said, I'll now get off my soapbox. Hope to see you at the General Meeting.

Allan McNeill

President's Report . . .

Maybe it's because I've just been teaching Shakespeare's sonnets that I'm so keenly aware of Time at the moment: "Time's scythe," "Devouring Time," "Time's fell hand (in the process of defacing things)." Then there's Andrew Marvell:

But at my back I always hear
Time's winged chariot hurrying near;

"Had we but world enough, and time," all of us at this institution could no doubt make thoughtful and well considered decisions about the shape of the education offered and of our lives here over the next few years. But we haven't, and Time's winged chariot is forcing us to settle some important issues.

You will see in this issue that Ian McAskill has written about some of the contract matters to be discussed at the general meeting on the 29th. This is not THE ANNUAL general meeting, which will take place in Chilliwack in the spring and will include refreshments, elections, and such things. This is A general meeting necessary to prepare us for negotiations. This meeting is important immediately because you do NOT want your association adopting positions on such matters as workload and evaluations and salaries without your having some say in these matters.

In early October, we struck a contract committee to look specifically at contract issues raised by the change of status of our institution. Germaine Baril has chaired this group, and has done her best (which is pretty darned good) to identify and structure the issues, make sure that meetings take place

and minutes are kept, and generally to keep everyone informed. This committee was widely representative in theory; in fact, it was impossible to find meeting times which accommodated everyone. But among the more active members of the group were Tom Davis, Kathy Gowdridge, Jane Dean, Richard Heyman, Kevin Busswood, Rob Woodside, Bob Smith, Gloria Wolfson, Judy Inouye, and Ian and me. We have tried to hash out a position (if not exact contract language) on such thorny issues as workload, career ladder and vacancies. "Had we but world enough and time," this and material on other possible contract changes would all be sent to you along with a questionnaire, results would be tabulated, positions revised, a meeting called . . . but, hey, there's Time's winged chariot. Meetings are proceeding with SFU and Open University, the timetable's waiting, folks have to be hired--so negotiations must begin.

That doesn't mean that this meeting on the 29th will be your *only* opportunity to voice your opinion on contract issues. As a result of the meeting's discussion, Ian will be designing and circulating a questionnaire to canvass priorities and elicit suggestions.

Don't let Time's Chariot overtake you (at least, not yet)! COME TO THE MEETING ON THE 29TH! IN ABBOTSFORD. IN THE LECTURE THEATRE. AT 3:30 P.M. EVERYONE!

A Provincial Perspective:

I've spent several precious week-ends at C-IEA meetings in Vancouver. Our

provincial union, whatever its strengths and weaknesses, is becoming a lobbying force to reckon with in the province. At Presidents' Council meetings in the past two months, the presidents of associations across the province have agreed upon positions on several key issues. Among these are:

1. The new funding proposal tabled by the Deputy Minister of Education, or "Multi-year" funding. Although everyone in the system welcomes the notion of planning beyond one year, this new proposal has some disturbing implications. It does not propose to correct the gross underfunding built into the post-secondary system over the past few years. In addition, it contains many references to "productivity" (and making funding dependent on productivity) without any adequate definition of the term. I will be happy to respond to questions on this topic. In the meantime, the executive will be discussing the proposal, and bringing our objections to the College so that we might lobby the government together on this issue.

2. University-college legislation. At some future point, the government will either be revising the Colleges and Institutes Act or introducing entirely new legislation which will govern university colleges. The presidents of the associations for the four institutions involved met for a week-end in late November to draft a policy statement which C-IEA will use as a basis for its lobbying with the government. If you are interested in seeing the draft position paper which came out of this meeting, please contact the FSA office.

3. C-IEA has joined with other unions involved in post-secondary education across Canada to form the Council of Post-Secondary Unions. They have been meeting

in Ottawa to share mutual concerns, the most immediately pressing of which is the federal government's decision to sign agreements with the provinces to privatize much of the trades and vocational education (sponsored by such agencies as "manpower"). This move on the government's part, if carried through, will have enormous ramifications for community colleges, especially for our colleagues in the trades and vocational training areas.

4. C-IEA has arranged meetings on the provincial level with other unions representing staff in the educational institutions (CUPE, BCGEU, etc.) Ed Lavalley reports that these meetings have been much more difficult to arrange than he anticipated, but they are finally taking place.

5. Just for your information: eight college faculty associations have voted in favour of participating in co-ordinated bargaining. CNC, Malaspina, Okanagan, Selkirk, AWU, Langara, and VCCFA have confirmed; North Island, which has only recently been certified, is voting on the 24th, and will probably join the others. If the system works well, then we will be re-visited with the choice in the next round of bargaining.

And locally:

The Agreements (labour/management) Committee has been particularly active this term. As a result of ongoing discussions and in the wake of a series of staff meetings, they are ready to sign the agreement on the addition of two new pay grades to the staff salary scale. On Monday the 20th, the Agreements committee met to consider three issues: Selection Advisory Committees, the Step 8 "cap" for faculty hiring, and the ramifications of "cost-recovery" courses in the instructional area. I attended, along with

Betty Harris (FSA Agreements Chair). Since 90% of our grievances result from the decisions of SAC's, both the association and the college need to look carefully at the process, the training of people on the SAC's, and any other ways these committees can function more smoothly. With the report of the Learning Environment Committee to ACCESS, and with everyone's desire to see

this process go smoothly, we will be recommending some procedures for improvement.

Time's winged chariot, driven by Fenella Sobchuk, is at my back. She needs this entry in now. So, between now and the next newsletter, I'll see you all on the 29th.

Virginia Cooke

Report from the First Staff Vice President . . .

A funny thing happened to me in the library one day. I came upon some information that could be very useful to a great number of you here at the University College. Let me explain.

Haven't you ever been curious as to what people at this College make in a year? Wouldn't you like to do a bit of comparison shopping? Well, here's your chance.

The Library has, in its reference section, a couple of small binders called *Statement of Expenditures*. Between the covers you will find everyone's salary from the President on down. You can not only see what everyone made in one year, but you can also see what they made the following year. You might wish to compare your salary changes from one year to the next with other positions in the College. Some people, you will find, received increases substantially greater than other people, due to, perhaps, reclassification, overtime, or some other anomaly. For example, some excluded people received increases ranging from 9% right up to 24%. We should not only be aware of these increases, we should question

why these have occurred in some instances and not in others. When negotiations centre on salary increases and cost of living increases, this type of information could be useful in order to justify the need for upward adjustments to our payscale.

Upward classification to some staff positions might be more easily effected if comparisons are made to some of the excluded secretarial support positions within the College. For example, if the work performed by directors' administrative assistants are similar in scope to some of the excluded positions, then a reclassification is quite possible. In fact, with the new Associate Dean positions that have now been created, there will be a need to hire at least one administrative assistant. Given that the Associate Deans will be doing similar tasks that are done by the Deans, the new structure being horizontal rather than vertical, it would then follow that any work delegated to his administrative assistant will be similar to that already being done by the existing Dean's assistant.

If a new administrative assistant's position is created, it has to be classified comparably --

in other words, it must be similar to the administrative assistant position which already exists. To do otherwise is to contradict past practices exercised by the classification process and by the members who sit on the

Job Classification Audit Committee (JCAC). Our FSA representatives on the JCAC must be diligent on this one, to ensure that fairness prevails and that it also appears to prevail.

Richard Heyman

Report from the Contract Chair . . .

With Christmas behind us, we can tuck away our wish lists and brood over our VISA bills. It is also time for us to begin thinking about our collective agreement which expires March 31. While I was on leave last semester, work began with many discussions in Staff meetings and in the University-College Contract Issues Subcommittee, Chaired by Germaine Baril. The product of this formative work is presented in some of the articles in this newsletter, and all matters are open for discussion at our upcoming general meeting, Wednesday, January 29th., 3:30 PM at the Ab. Theatre. In the remaining time leading up to that meeting, discussions are continuing to begin formalizing our positions on some of the more difficult issues including workload release for scholarly activity and evaluation.

In preparation for this round of negotiations, I am given to reflect on the issues of the previous round of negotiations, our achievements and our desires yet to be realized. Last time, though we made considerable progress toward bringing our college salaries into line with the other institutions, I am very mindful of the perilously close vote to accept the agreement in April, 1990. I am also mindful of the periodic difficulties the college has experienced over the past two years in attracting recruits within the prescribed salary

placement. This suggests to me that, on salaries and benefits, we must be vigilant in securing parity with the other institutions in this round of bargaining. With the coming expansion of the institution, we have much at stake. Second rate salaries will not attract first rate instructors.

As we enter negotiations, we should remember that we are one union, faculty and staff, and we are the only such creature like that in the system. This has worked well for the college and it has worked well for us in fostering a collegiality not found at other colleges our size. As we now contemplate the expansion we have given birth to, let us work to maintain this collegiality in our shared endeavour as the school expands.

As I noted in an earlier article, I am structuring negotiations with the assistance of three subcommittees. The University-College Subcommittee is considering contract issues related to the expansion. Upper-level instructor workload, scholarly activity, and instructor evaluation are some major issues which have been discussed. We are not entertaining (nor will we) a new or expanded salary scale for upper level instructors. We have embraced the notion that scholarly activity is accessible to all instructors. We are working toward an evaluation system which can accommodate all instructors using

common criteria, allowing individuals instructing at different levels the ability to be evaluated in varying degrees on their instruction, scholarly activity, college service etc. as their job and interests dictate. These issues are far-reaching and will shape the working environment for years to come. Your input and participation in this process is critical to our success. The sub-committee's proposals are detailed for your perusal elsewhere in this issue of the *Newsletter*.

I have also struck an informal benefits subcommittee, chaired by Ron Laye, to examine our benefits package and possible improvements. We are concerned not only with the share paid by the employer and the employee, but also with the coverages. Over the last year of our current contract period, improvement was achieved, and we will seek, at a minimum, to obtain coverage 100% paid by the employer for basic medical, dental, extended and life, as has been commonplace in the college system for some years now. We will be examining coverages as well. Again, your input is welcome here to provide us with information where you believe the coverages should be improved.

The third subcommittee is composed of staff members to deal with strictly staff issues. Cathy Davis, from the Chilliwack LRC, has offered to Chair this subcommittee, and many other staff members from previous negotiations have offered their assistance. With the coming expansion, there is opportunity for career growth within the staff component, and that is one issue which has already generated much discussion in the University College subcommittee. The general consensus among staff is a desire to secure new opportunities wherever possible for our members. There has been much discussion about career "laddering" and

internal applicant status. These issues, as the others, require consideration by the membership at large, and will be one of the subjects addressed at our general meeting.

We have already achieved a framework for career laddering with the expansion of the staff bargaining unit to include the anticipated administrative positions of pay grades 9, 10 and 11. New positions fall within the rating system used for existing positions. To further support the career ladder concept, I suggested in an earlier staff meeting that a career secondment program may be considered by staff to facilitate on-the-job training by enabling existing staff to be seconded to new activities as vacancies occur or as arrangements may be made among staff members to swap positions and diversify their experience. While this has a short-run negative impact on overall productivity (as replacement personnel get "up on the learning curve"), the long-run benefits are for a better-trained, more versatile and knowledgeable workforce. This undoubtedly requires some co-ordination (and expense) on the part of the personnel unit, but if successful, it would be a tremendous benefit for the university college.

All faculty and staff members are invited to attend any of the subcommittee meetings on contract issues, and your participation is very much welcomed. Please do not hesitate to contact Fenella Sobchuk to find out the time and place of the various meetings.

I personally look forward to serving the Association in negotiations at this critical time, and I welcome your guidance at any time.

Ian J. McAskill

Deliberations of the Standing Committee on Faculty Evaluation . . .

You may recall that, in 1990, the FSA struck a subcommittee to deal with the question of faculty evaluation, in particular the issue of what role collegial evaluation should play. In February 1990, Perla Werk, Don Tunstall, Dick Bate and I attended a conference on the subject of faculty evaluation to obtain some perspectives and ideas about alternative methodologies. Since that time, we have had some discussions, but we have also faced a shifting context for our review with the emergence of our university-college status, which has created further impetus for this review, and new issues not anticipated by our initial desire for review.

At the risk of oversimplifying the issues surrounding faculty evaluation, the FSA's initial interest had to do with the consistency and application of the collegial component in the evaluation process. At issue then was the perceived potential for the collegial component to be used as the sole basis for an unsatisfactory performance evaluation. At the same time, if I understand it correctly, the college management's position was that student evaluations alone are an insufficient basis for evaluation.

With our change to university-college status, it is generally accepted that evaluation of third and fourth year instructors must place some formal emphasis on scholarly activity, the degree to which is not clear. In this respect, it is clear that student questionnaires are an insufficient basis for the evaluation of this component. No faculty member has been excluded from eligibility to engage in scholarly activity; indeed, all should be

actively encouraged. Hence, evaluation of scholarly activity should be open to all faculty who so choose. This does not mean that classroom teaching is to be subordinated in the evaluation process. It will be the case in our university-college that different instructors will have differing commitments to scholarly activity, and rightly will expect to be evaluated in recognition of these differences.

The conference that Perla and I attended was extremely useful in providing a model for faculty evaluation, which has been applied in both two year and four year colleges in the U.S. (and is also currently under consideration at Malaspina College). The evaluation framework proposed is more broadly-based than classroom instruction and student questionnaires. A number of factors in addition to instruction are considered, along with other sources of information in addition to student questionnaires. For example, these other factors may be considered appropriate subjects for evaluation by colleagues (both within and outside the institution), Department Heads or Administrators.

Returning to the initial problem of a consistent framework for faculty evaluation to be applied college-wide, the model proposes the development of individual portfolios, reflecting the differing mixes of instructional and non-instructional contributions of the various faculty. Components are identified along with certain minima or maxima that each will contribute to the overall evaluation. An example will clarify. Cited below is a

model evaluation consisting of four criteria. (There could be more.) For each criterion, a minimum and maximum weight is ascribed. The actual weightings (within the bounds)

would be her particular duties and functions: (This example could apply to instructors without a large commitment to scholarly activity.)

Minimum Weight

75%

Teaching

10%

College Service

0%

Scholarly Activity

0%

Community Service

Maximum Weight

90%

25%

10%

10%

Teaching, for example, would include classroom teaching, developing new course materials, etc. College service would include participation in department and college meetings, serving on college committees, sponsoring or advising student groups, etc. Scholarly activity and other components

require definition, both of what is to be assessed and who is to assess it.

For instructors with a greater commitment to scholarly activity (either by choice or by the requirements of 3rd and 4th year courses) the weighting might be as follows:

Minimum Weight

50%

Teaching

10%

College Service

20%

Scholarly Activity

0%

Community Service

Maximum Weight

75%

25%

40%

10%

It is easy for our discussions to get bogged down in the detail of the particular information sources and evaluation instruments to carry this out. Focusing for the moment on the idea of a portfolio approach, it would be worthwhile for us to obtain some feedback from the membership

about the idea of broadening the evaluation as described above.

In our discussions thus far, we have not considered changing the student questionnaire, as this was not at issue. If we can establish a 'portfolio' of the other things

to be evaluated, we can then work to establish a structure for the various inputs, including collegial input and their weightings in the evaluation process. We are naturally awaiting the deliberations of the learning environment committee to guide the FSA Executive and our subcommittee as to what scholarly activity is, as it is obviously important to know what is being evaluated

before we can work out how it is to be evaluated.

It is my intention to proceed with our discussions only with full participation on the part of faculty. We are in no way bound by the above framework and this article is intended to stimulate discussion. Your feedback is critical. Please give us your thoughts c/o the FSA office.

Ian McAskill

Meanderings of the FSA Contract Subcommittee on University-College Issues on Workload Compensation and Scholarly Activity . . .

Our subcommittee has engaged in considerable discussion and debate with respect to the transition to a university college and the new ongoing commitment that some faculty will face concomitant with upper division course instruction. For the purpose of developing a bargaining position, it is now time to begin setting out that which we are agreed about, and identify issues about which we must canvas the broader membership.

There have been three general areas of concern surrounding the addition of upper division courses. The first has to do with implementation of the upper division program. Second, is the ongoing requirement of scholarly activity on the part of upper division instructors. Third, is the recognition of scholarly activity for instructors other than those with upper division course work. Let us deal with these three issues separately.

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

There is a very real start-up cost associated with the addition of upper division course work that must be recognized in workload allocations during the implementation phase. The development of a new course entails considerable preparation, aside from instruction, for example, the development of course content, the development and coordination of curriculum support (books, journals, etc.), the development of assignments and an evaluation regime consistent with the sponsoring institutions, the development, implementation and fine-tuning of the programmatic links among departments, and the additional academic support for upper level students (advising, developing research work for students, and assisting with references and career placement, to name a few). This latter

implementation phase; it is also an ongoing activity after courses are in place.

ONGOING SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

In the ongoing delivery of the upper division course work, it is generally held that instructors have a greater responsibility to maintain a program of scholarly activity, over that currently required of the college instructors. If scholarly activity is required of upper division instructors, while not required of lower division instructors, then this must be recognized in a commensurately lower instructional load. To propose that the teaching load be the same for both lower and upper division instruction, foists a greater relative workload on those teaching upper division courses.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY FOR ALL INSTRUCTORS:

In the discussions about workload, a third area of workload recognition has been identified in the so-called Busswood initiative. This proposal essentially calls for workload recognition beyond that strictly associated with upper division instruction, and argues that scholarly activity recognition be given for community and college activities which fall within the mission and goals of a comprehensive college and within a broad definition of scholarly activity, but have hitherto not been recognized as a part of instructional workload.

PROPOSALS TO CONSIDER:

Three conclusions follow from the above: (1) There should be a workload recognition for the initiation of new courses. (2) There should be workload recognition for the ongoing scholarly activity required with upper

division instruction. (3) UCFV should recognize the broad base of other scholarly activities not strictly associated with upper level instruction. The following specific proposals are open for discussion:

WORKLOAD COMPENSATION IN IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

To enable as many of our existing faculty as possible to take an active part in the development of the upper division courses and programs, it is proposed that for each new course (upper as well as lower division) developed in support of new programs, that workload credit be given on a one-time basis at two for one. That is, the initial workload credit be double the ongoing credit, with a maximum of two new courses per year for any instructor. The same need not apply for new instructors where they may already possess the requisite course expertise either from recently completed course work or teaching experience with the course elsewhere.

WORKLOAD COMPENSATION FOR ONGOING SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

In addition to the above, it is proposed that UCFV adopt the conventional workload compensation arrangement for scholarly activity in place at the other university colleges. However, at UCFV, the workload compensation arrangement must be flexible to enable all instructors (new and old) to assume a mix of lower and upper division course work. It is our plan that instructors at UCFV not be separated in duties such that some teach only third and fourth year courses, while others teach exclusively first and second year courses. Rather than a differential course load per se, a course workload credit scheme could be

workload credit scheme could be implemented. For example, the conventional workload compensation for scholarly activity at the other university colleges provides for a 6 course load for those instructing exclusively third and fourth year courses. Proportionate workload compensation using a credit scheme would allow each upper level section to count for 1.33 lower level sections.

Additionally, to enable an effective program of scholarly activity, instructors eligible for the workload compensation could elect to bank their credits, if a block of free time is required by them to develop an effective program of scholarly activity. (For some, such as in the sciences, engaging in primary research may require access to research facilities not available at UCFV.) To obtain a period of time free of instruction, instructors might choose a greater course load than the minimum each year, banking their course credits to use later or combine with educational leave (paid, partially paid or unpaid) to enable a "sabbatical" semester every so often. As an example, an instructor with a split upper and lower level course assignment teaching 8 sections per year (four upper division, four lower division) would

earn a 1.3 section credit (on an eight course base) per year, which would afford a full semester release for scholarly activity after the sixth year, without combining other leave benefits. (Program areas working on a lower than 8 course base would obtain the same outcome based on different section credits.) (Note: these are my numbers put forward for discussion only. The subcommittee has yet to establish its position on the numbers.)

WORKLOAD CREDIT FOR OTHER SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Workload compensation for other scholarly activity not associated with third and fourth year course instruction could be allocated in accordance with the Busswood proposal. In recognition of these other scholarly activities, the College would be obligated to make available a certain number of workload compensation credits (ie. course release funds) and the allocation of these will rest with a joint committee using a method and criteria much the same as is in place for educational leave.

Ian McAskill

Editor's Note: This is the first of two parts. The article will also be published in Thunder Stick, the journal of the Vancouver's Men's Evolvment Network, in the Winter 1992 issue.

Into the Black with Meade and Bly . . .

It's open season on the men's movement. It had to happen. It was only a matter of time. After--what, thirty centuries?--of lording it over all creation, men are finally taking the

weekend off, howling together around the campfire, and trying to remember what on earth they had been thinking of before they started so confidently down that long, wrong

road. It is an alarming spectacle, and the popular press now regularly holds up the part-time wild man as an object of derision.

The cynicism of some women, for a time, is to be expected. But what is surprising (though I'm not sure why it should be) is the nervous response of so many men. With a single ironic question mark ("Male Bonding: An Update?"), and a knack for taking things out of context, the editor of *Harper's* made Tom Daly look like an idiot for fashioning a spear with his own hands. In the Vancouver *Sun*, Stan Persky decided the movement was a 'fad', declared men's workshops "a bit silly", and recommended the model of his own initiation in the U.S. Navy, which "for better or worse, had real boats, real guns, and a real world to see." Bill Richardson offered "Ironing John", a spoof workshop where for a mere \$500 local toy soldiers got to play tag with their archetypes all weekend by wrestling with Bill's laundry and looking for the Wild Man at the bottom of a sink full of Bill's dishes.

Then, just in time for the Christmas stocking-stuffer market, came an entire book devoted to turning the American Men's Journal, *Wingspan*, into *Thingspan* and making jokes about Robert Bly's vests. The front end of Sam Keen's *Fire in the Belly* got spliced to the rear end of *Iron John* to create *Fire in the John*. Amusing, amusing, but a man needs an Iron Belly to keep his sense of humour amidst all this ribaldry.

A truly poisonous attack appeared in the October *Esquire*. Doug Stanton signed up for New Warrior Training with the clear intent of doing a guerrilla expose of "nineties Real Men who growl and yodel to protect what's theirs (their balls, among other things), weep and moan over what they've lost (their

minds, it seems), and kick the world's ass without apology while smiling at feminists." If fear and loathing is what you start with, of course, fear and loathing is what you get. Stanton wept and moaned quite a bit himself over his treatment at the hands of "goons" who wanted him to leave his hair drier behind the bar, and wound up calling the men's movement "a therapeutic circus of monied fellows."

Monied fellows! *Monied fellows!* This was, after all, *Esquire* open on the desk before me: "The Magazine for Men" of means. John Berger taught us long ago that you can't separate the message of a magazine's articles from the message of the ads. On one page, Stanton held forth: "The goons stood in a solemn line behind a conference table, longing to be badasses, squinting through a curtain of cheap cigar smoke." On the facing page, the publisher paid the bill: a full-page spread for a thousand-dollar business suit by BOSS, modeled by a boss-looking stud with power shoulders and very clenched fists, photographed sitting right on top of a (strangely pensive) third world beauty (presumably not a boss).

I recalled that Persky himself, that implacable foe of the loin cloth and the hair shirt, had come out not too long ago in favour of a Benetton billboard featuring an interracial bevy of flawless faces--white, yellow, black, brown--set off prettily against designer clothes. Eureka! A whole new dimension to the concept of political correctness. Yuppies of colour!

And when the *whores de commerce* aren't attacking the men's movement, they're co-opting it. There's a new beer commercial that cuts from a hairless guru to a stone god to a scene of half-naked men dancing round

the fire, and then, via images of bank towers and turning gears, to (guess what?) a beautiful babe in swimwear walking endlessly toward us as seen through the neck of a bottle, which is also a telephoto lens, which is also a gun barrel, which is also, as always in these commercials, our good old tireless buddy one-eyed Jack. Bang, click, pop, honey--you're dead.

But here and there, among the cheap-shot artists and parasites, serious people are asking questions that need to be asked. Clearly, for example, there is still widespread confusion about the politics of the whole thing. Betty Friedan apparently told Stanton she thought "these Wildman and Warrior weekends are an attempt to *rigidify* the macho mask."

Nothing, I submit, could be further from the truth. Everything I've listened to and read has been so deeply rooted in concern over racism, poverty, gangs, urban blight, homophobia, abuse of women and children, environmental pillage, and rampant materialism that I wonder how anyone who has been paying attention could not know where the heart of this movement lies. In fact, at a workshop in Tacoma back in February, Robert Bly and Michael Meade got themselves into a tight political corner. Bush and Schwarzkopf were rampaging through the Gulf at the time, and when the discussion turned to the war, and men in the audience began expressing their true feelings, neither

Bly nor Meade looked at all comfortable with the number of pro-war sentiments that got expressed. But a large contingent of disillusioned Vietnam vets was also in attendance, and their contributions made it clear that this movement has enormous potential to re-empower men who have been wandering in an emotional and political wasteland for decades.

The concept of re-empowering men, of course, is what makes so many women so nervous just now. Most of my female friends are having a very hard time seeing the men's movement, especially when rituals of phallic potency are so reportable, as anything but a last-ditch attempt to hold on to the levers of power. But thrusting office buildings, V-2 rockets, tanks with long cannons on them, and all the aggressive, genocidal apparatus of the military-industrial complex were not built by men who were secure in their gender identity, but by overgrown adolescents who were not. "Big Toys for Big Boys" is how Robert Bateman describes it. Robert Moore says "patriarchy" is a misnomer for a system that is in fact a "puerarchy". Women and children get beaten and killed not by men who feel powerful but by men who feel impotent, and who can only imagine using fists and guns to get even. The men's movement is not about growing bigger, it is about growing up.

Graham Dowden

In the next issue, Graham writes of his experiences when he attended a day-long men's workshop led by Robert Bly and Michael Meade.

David and Barry's Excellent Wine Adventures . . .

(Part Two)

This is a story about Cabernet, corkscrews and plastic glasses. The names mentioned in this story have been made up, any resemblance to living U.C.F.V. employees is purely intentional. For the purposes of this story, their names will be Dave, a new Associate Dean; Rory, an old, mature faculty member; and Barry, the owner of a corkscrew and purveyor of plastic glasses.

The story takes place on January 8, 1992, in B 210 Business Office. The three main characters in our story have assembled to examine two bottles of Cabernet Sauvignon. New Dave has a brown paper bag containing a bottle of Vina Carmen Cabernet Sauvignon 1987, costing \$9.95. The Cabernet Sauvignon is a small tough-skinned grape which gives the distinction to the red wines of Bordeaux. Cabernet Sauvignon is widely planted in Australia, where its wine is generally good; in Chile, where it is excellent, like a light Bordeaux; and in California, where in the mid-1980's many fine vintages were bottled. All Cabernet wines gain by age in bottle as well as wood. New Dave has chosen Vina Carmen because it is available in most liquor stores and wants Old Rory and Corkscrew Barry to try a wine from Chile. Corkscrew Barry has chosen the same colour bag and grape variety but picked a new California product: J. Wile and Sons. It also cost \$9.95 and is also a 1987 vintage. Old Rory drew the long straw and didn't have to buy this time.

New Dave was put in charge of the corkscrew, and after much grunting and strange facial expressions the two bottles

were uncorked. The corks died a horrible death (the corkscrew and owner were held to blame). With cork under foot the tasting (in plastic glasses) began. The tasters chose the J. Wile to test first. California has over 350,000 acres of vineyards and the climate allows for wines as diverse and crisp as light Rieslings, Zinfandels of Port-like power and concentration, and Cabernet's that are usually good. The testers felt that the J. Wile and Sons cabernet had a colour that was very deep and rich with a lively and interesting bouquet. The finish was felt to be slightly flat without a great balance between fruit and tannin. The taste (lacking some structure) was relatively light. Having said that, all felt that for the money it was good. As a complement to a meal, barbecued pork would probably suffice because the acidity of the wine would cut through any fatty quality.

At this point in the proceedings, tasters should cleanse the palate with bread and clean the plastic glasses. Not having bread and being too lazy to clean the plastic, our three characters moved on to Chile. Chile is the twelfth largest wine producer in the world with over 301,000 acres of vineyards and produces probably the finest wines in South America. The group of three found the Vina Carmen cabernet, like the Wile, had a very deep rich colour and a bouquet that matched the California product. It was in the areas of finish and taste where they felt there was a difference. The Vina Carmen had good balance with a lingering and fairly deep finish. The taste was more structured; "deep", "velvety" and "smooth" were words used to describe the taste with a berry feel. It

tasted like a good Bordeaux and was described as a "hit the back of the tongue" style wine. It should be noted that there was no consensus on the taste as compared to the J.Wile. Some in the room felt there really wasn't that much difference. As for food it would be appropriate with roast lamb and heavier flavoured meats.

Grades?

J. Wile was given a "B" and the Vina Carmen a "B+". It was the unanimous opinion that both were a good value and wouldn't disappoint at a dinner party. But if you want to buy just one, go with Chile.

New Dave received a grade of "D-" for his absolute and total destruction of the two

corks. He was described as a literate Arnold Schwarzenegger with a corkscrew. Old Rory got top marks (A) for the artistic rendering made when he decided to spill his wine over the notes he took. Of course the plastic glasses and owner were held to blame. (You can dress these guys up but you can't take them anywhere.)

As our story ends, Corkscrew Barry is seen leaving B 210, having been told to take his corkscrew and plastic glasses, go home and write this story. New Dave and Old Rory, half empty bottles in hand, walk off together into the rain.

Barry Bompas

COLUMN

The New World Order and Tradition: Part 1 . . .

Modernity emerged through a break with pre-modern thought, and the great minds who achieved that break were aware of what they were doing.

Leo Strauss

No one is obliged to take part in the spiritual crises of a society; on the contrary, everyone is obliged to avoid this folly and live an ordered life.

Eric Voegelin

George Bush, in the last few months, has spoken at great length about a New World order. When the UN was formed at the end

of WWII, the language of a New World Order was very much in vogue. It is myopic of us, though, to restrict the meaning of this

without too much difficulty, be equated with what has come to be known as Modernity, Secularism or Liberalism.

The values of Modernity are about 500 years old. By the 15th Century, the Classical-Medieval synthesis had fossilized, and Tradition (which, in principle, is meant to provide signposts for the authentic life) had become legalistic and corrupt. When Columbus set sail for the *novus mundi* (new world) in 1492, God, gold, country (and the conquistadores) were so interdependent, it was virtually impossible to determine where one began and the other ended. Christianity, which began as a religion that refused to bow before Caesar, had, by the time of Columbus, become a compliant state religion. The Reformation-Renaissance turned a corner in world history, and since that turn, a new world order has come into being, and this new perspective is significantly different from the Classical-Medieval Tradition.

The advocates of the New World Order consciously and deliberately turned their backs on many principles that were tenaciously held by people in the past. Productivity replaced contemplation, contract crushed covenant, immanence swallowed up transcendence, knowledge banished wisdom, and the present closed the curtain on the past. Values sent the virtues into exile, historical consciousness (historicity) relativized insight, and a functional, technical rationalism stoned those who celebrated the role of the receptive, participatory intellect. Justice lost its rudder to the general will, pragmatism and process replaced purpose and direction, freedom and power conspired together to reshape and redefine nature, rights have been used to legitimate any sort of behaviour, love has been trivialized and the modern use of language has altered the meanings of words.

The primacy of the individual has dissolved community, the state has become the new *pater* and *mater familias* and education has become a rite of passage for those who seek to make it in our New World Order in which economics and power dominate.

The victory of Modernity was recognized by Hegel in 1806, and discussed in more detail by his French interpreter, Alexandre Kojève, this century. The controversial article, *The End of History*, by Francis Fukuyama, sums up, in a simplistic way, what the end of history means. Fukuyama insisted that the essential values of liberalism have emerged as the defining feature of the modern world, and it is these values that precondition how we see things. In short, history as the arena of competing intellectual-political perspectives is over. We now live in a post-historical world in which liberalism has won, and the future is merely a matter of fleshing out the values of liberalism in different places.

We need to ask ourselves serious questions about the modern project, though, and attempt to discern whether we should think and live within its framework or challenge the foundation on which it stands. Have we really reached the end of history, and is it our fate to abide by the conventions of Modernity, or are there other markings and signposts to heed? These questions are fundamental, and if truly attended to, force us to face the disturbing fact that the way we perceive things is limited by the prejudices of Modernity. Is it possible to stand out of the habitation we inhabit, and if so, from what perspective?

It is folly to romanticize Tradition, but it is equally naive to idealize Modernity. If we ever hope to understand our modern superstitions, we need to stand before this

New World Order, see it for what it is and wedge open its weak spots.

F. Nietzsche lamented the victory of The New World Order, but he also cut to the core of its limitations. Nietzsche argued that Liberalism, given its presuppositions (primacy of the individual, freedom, historicity, equality), could only produce three types of people. The first type of person Nietzsche called the 'last man'. The 'last man' craved private comforts, security and amusements, and these type of people would sell their souls to attain these goals. The 'last man' was also eager to be 'well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed, and well-medicated by ordinary physicians and psychiatrists'. Nietzsche's second type was the nihilists. Nihilists scoffed and laughed at the petty values of the 'last man', and they set out to devalue all values and create a new set of values. The 'last man', of course, would not protest too loudly, provided their comfortable self preservation and limited interests were protected. The nihilists insisted that to be human is to be free, and freedom means the willingness to make

oneself into whatever one chooses. The actual content of such values is never clear, because values will change, protean-like, contingent on an understanding of the self and freedom. The third type, those with a 'will to power' would be the rulers of the day. Nihilists and those with the creative 'will to power' converge at many points. If values are something we make, as Nihilists assert, then it is the powerful who will make and enforce the values that will dominate.

The merging interests of the 'last man', the 'nihilists' and those who assert the 'will to power', describes in graphic detail, significant aspects of the last 500 years of Western history, and it highlights why we have the many unresolved and unresolvable tensions within our liberal democratic societies. The New World Order we live in is a feudal world in which the powerful have used their will to reshape the face of the earth into an object of their egoistic desires, the Nihilists have created the conditions for the powerful to act like bullies and the 'last man' have reaped the material comforts without a whiff of protest.

Ron Dart

FSA Executive 1991/92

President	Virginia Cooke	4293
First Faculty Vice-President	Susan Milner	4321
Second Faculty Vice-President	Tom Davis	4533
First Staff Vice-President	Richard Heyman	4333
Second Staff Vice-President	Sybille StegmueLLer	2462
Treasurer	Kathy Gowdridge	4358
Recording Secretary	Dianne Griffiths	4282
Grievance Chair (Faculty)	Perla Werk	4363
Grievance Chair (Staff)	Jane Antil	4253
Communications Chair	Allan McNeill	4321
Job Classification Audit Chair	Dorine Garibay	4238
Professional Development Chair	Germaine Baril	4291
Contract Chair	Ian McAskill	4523
Agreements Chair	Betty Harris	4510
Occupational Health & Safety	Leslie Wood	4223

Executive Meeting Schedule

Abbotsford, 1:00 p.m. (Week 4)

January	22
February	19
March	18
April	15
May	13
June	10